



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/465,198	12/15/1999	NICK J. MAZZARELLA	1	8604

30594 7590 03/13/2003

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 8910  
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

LEI, TSULEUN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.K.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/465,198

Applicant(s)

MAZZARELLA, NICK J.

Examiner

T. Richard Lei

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2684

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as follows.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2684

3. Claims 1-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,402) in view of Vaman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,011,780).

Regarding Claim 1, Ferguson teaches a method for controlling messages in a communication system. Ferguson does not teach that a first network component has the function of sending out a message blocking request. Vaman, however, teaches a method for controlling messages in a communication system comprising the steps of receiving a message blocking request from a first network component (Vaman, Fig.8, where the destination node sends out a link failure indication to block the traffic from the failed link) at a second network component (Vaman, Fig.1, Intelligent Controller), the message blocking request identifying a third network component (Vaman, Fig.8, identifying the source node); and preventing messages from being communicated from the third network component to the first network component (Vaman, Fig.8) if the second network component accepts the message blocking request based on an evaluation of the communication system.

Regarding Claim 2, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of preventing is

Art Unit: 2684

performed at the second network component (Vaman, Fig.1, Intelligent Controller).

Regarding Claim 3, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of sending a message blocking command to the third network component (Vaman, Fig.8, where the destination node sends out a link failure indication to block the traffic from the failed link).

Regarding Claim 4, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the step of preventing is performed at the third network component (Vaman, Fig.8, Source node selects a different path).

Regarding Claim 5, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the message blocking request specifies a duration of a blocking period (Ferguson, Col.4, Lines 11-18).

Regarding Claim 6, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the message blocking request specifies at least one acceptance interval during a blocking period, the acceptance interval being a period during which at

Art Unit: 2684

least one message may be communicated from the third network component to the first network component (Ferguson, Col.3, Lines 43-46; and Col.4, Lines 5-18).

Regarding Claim 7, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the message blocking request specifies an action to be taken by the third network element instead of communicating a message from the third network component to the first network component (Vaman, Fig.8, Source node selects a different path).

Regarding Claim 8, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the second network component may modify the action specified in the message blocking request (Ferguson, Col.4, Lines 5-18, incorporating a call control message into query responses; also, Col.3, Lines 20-23).

Regarding Claim 17, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the action includes communicating the message from the third network component to a specified alternate destination (Vaman, Fig.8, Source node selects a different path by going through a different node).

Art Unit: 2684

4. Claims 9-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al. in view of Vaman and further in view of Hartmaier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,672).

Regarding Claim 9, Ferguson as modified by Vaman teaches a method for controlling messages in a communication system, comprising the steps of: receiving a message blocking request from a first switching center at a system control function component (SCF), the message blocking request identifying a second switching center; and preventing messages from being communicated from the second switching center to the first switching center (see Ferguson's and Vaman's teaching in Claim 1). Ferguson does not teach that the switching centers can be wireless mobile switching centers (MSC). Hartmaier, however teaches an integrated wireless and wireline network with a common central control (Hartmaier, Fig.1 and Fig.2). Therefore, it would have obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hartmaier with that of Ferguson so the benefit of traffic congestion control can be extended also to the wireless network.

Art Unit: 2684

Regarding Claim 10, see Claim 2 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Regarding Claim 11, see Claim 3 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Regarding Claim 12, see Claim 4 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Regarding Claim 13, see Claim 5 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Regarding Claim 14, see Claim 6 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Regarding Claim 15, see Claim 7 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier

Regarding Claim 16, see Claim 8 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Regarding Claim 18, see Claim 17 and Claim 9 for the teaching of Ferguson, Vaman and Hartmaier.

Art Unit: 2684

**Conclusion**

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to T. Richard Lei whose telephone number is 703-305-4828. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 703-305-4778. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-5403 for regular communications and 703-308-5403 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

TRL

TRL

March 7, 2003

THANH CONG LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

TURBO

3/10/03